



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,148	06/15/2001	Robert L. Barrett	END920010071US1	7985

7590 10/25/2006

IBM Corporation  
N50/040-4  
1701 North Street  
Endicott, NY 13760

EXAMINER
----------

JEANTY, ROMAIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/882,148	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BARRETT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Romain Jeanty	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Final Office action is in response to the communication received July 31, 2006.  
Claims are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 are pending in the application.

### **Response to Arguments**

2. Applicant's arguments filed July 31, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See remarks below.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,915,270) in view of Barnes et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,802).

As per claim 1, Young et al disclose a customer relationship management business method comprising defining an engagement model which will be used to address a marketplace requirement (col. 2 line 59 through col. 3 line 28), thereafter using said engagement model to create an industry-wide engagement template applicable to all businesses in said marketplace (See Figure 6; col. 13, lines 61-66). Young et al does not explicitly disclose the concept of modifying said industry-wide engagement template to address requirements of a specific client

Art Unit: 3623

within said marketplace. However, modifying templates is old and well-known in the database art for allowing users to manipulate data in a marketplace. Including modifying said industry-wide engagement template to address requirements of a specific client within said marketplace would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art so that an end user may have different configurable templates that can be applied to different document types (i.e. e-mail, secure internal documents, database records, etc.). Further, Young et al does not explicitly disclose measuring, monitoring, and controlling a client engagement based upon said modified industry-wide engagement template. Barnes et al in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of utilizing a template for monitoring and controlling a client engagement based on an engagement template (col. 19, lines 35-46). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Young et al to include the teachings of Barnes et al in order to monitor development consistency across engagements.

As per claim 2, Barnes et al discloses the steps of enabling a generic engagement model for addressing said marketplace requirement, and generating work product descriptions specified by said engagement model (col. 7, lines 38-42).

As per claim 3, Young et al further discloses using said engagement model to create a plurality of industry-wide engagement templates each said template applicable to all businesses in each of a respective plurality of industries in said marketplace (col. 3, line 61 through 4 line 6).

As per claim 4, Barnes et al discloses wherein said generic engagement model includes definitions of best practices and reusable assets (col. 7, lines 38-42).

As per claim 5, Barnes et al discloses the step of creating attack, resource, and

Art Unit: 3623

deployment plans for said client engagement using said modified industry-wide engagement template (col. 7, lines 43-47).

As per claim 6, Barnes et al discloses the step of cyclically redefining said modified industry-wide engagement template while deploying said work product descriptions (col. 7, lines 48-51).

As per claim 7, Barnes et al discloses the step of allocating resources to further attack said marketplace requirement based upon said monitoring (col. 7, lines 51-53).

As per claims 8-9 are computer program product for instructing a processor to assist in performing a business engagement process, said computer program product comprising: a computer readable medium for performing the steps of rejected method claim 1 above. Therefore, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 1 above. In addition, Young further discloses a computer readable medium. Note col. 23, lines 32-35).

As per claim 10 and 12, Young et al further discloses wherein said engagement model is made up of a process description and is implemented as a work breakdown structure of phases, activities, tasks, work product descriptions, techniques, and roles (col. 5, lines 7-14).

As per claim 11 and 13, Barnes et al discloses wherein said engagement model defines what gets produced over the lifetime of said business engagement, roles required to perform said business engagement, and techniques to be used (col. 5, lines 24-30).

### **Remarks**

5. Applicant asserted that the combination of Barnes and Young fails to teach the claimed invention. Applicant further supported his argument by arguing that the combination of Barnes

Art Unit: 3623

does not describe creating an industry-wide engagement template. In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees because while Barnes teaches engagement model to create an engagement template which specifically addresses client requirements within the market place. Note the abstract of Barnes. While Barnes does not explicitly disclose creating an industry-wide engagement template. However, it is old and well known in the art to create an industry-wide engagement template to be used by different business users. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the creation of an industry-wide engagement template in the disclosures of Barnes because it would help users build communities around topics such as status reports, issue resolution, discussions, project deliverables and milestone. Applicant is directed to the teachings of Dialog Practicity, Inc. Launches Newest Version of Its Web-based Collaboration Software for Professional Service Organization-Practicity 4.0 Enables Service organization, Clients To Collaborative in One Secure Internet-enabled Environment.

### **Conclusion**

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Dialog "Practicity, Inc. Launches Newest Version of its Web-Based Collaboration Software for Professional Service Organization-Practicity 4.0 Enables Service Organization, Clients To Collaborative in one Secure Internet-enabled Environment) discloses the concept of allowing users to use an engagement template.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RJ  
October 16, 2006

  
Romain Jeanty  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3623